



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates; and the Problems of the Transmission of His Text. By ALFRED W. POLLARD. London, Alex. Moring, 1917. vii + 115 pp.

Readers who are familiar with Mr. Pollard's *Shakespeare Folios and Quartos* and his critical editions of texts will greet with interest the publication in book-form of his four lectures delivered as Sanders Reader in Bibliography at the University of Cambridge, November, 1915 (later printed under four separate titles in successive numbers of *The Library* for 1916, vol. VII). The book, *Shakespeare's Fight with the Pirates*, is substantially the same as the lectures, but contains additional material on the manuscripts, and an index and brief preface.

In the first chapter, on "The Regulation of the Book Trade in the Sixteenth Century," Mr. Pollard introduces the reader to a period when there seems to have been "no legal recognition of literary rights by appeal to which piracy could be defeated." The royal privilege for printing *ad imprimendum solum* he interprets as conferring not a sole, or exclusive printing right (as it has usually been construed), but a right "only for printing, *i. e.*, not for protection." The royal privileges in general he believes to have had an unsalutary effect in lending color to an assumption that an unprivileged work might fairly be considered as having no protection against piracy. Mr. Pollard traces concisely the governmental control of the press, interpreting significant passages of proclamations concerning printing from the year 1529. He sketches the rise of the Stationers' Company of London, its practises as a licensing body, and its function as bestower of a 'perpetual copy-right' (not, however, a *legal* right, in Mr. Pollard's opinion) upon the stationer who properly licensed and entered his book upon the Stationers' Registers. Though the author had, according to Mr. Pollard, no *legal* rights, he was nevertheless, if he secured an honest stationer, benefited financially and otherwise by the protection of this "informal" copyright secured through the private ordinances of the Stationers' Company.

In the second chapter, "Authors, Players, and Pirates in Shakespeare's Day," Mr. Pollard imaginatively reconstructs the probable course of publication of Shakespeare's plays. He discusses the status of actors, their attitude toward the publication of their plays, the possible sources of copy for pirated editions, the probable steps

by which the company of actors anticipated intended piracies or even perhaps regained control of pirated texts. This chapter gives the title to the book. The "fight with the pirates" is, of course, the theatrical company's fight, imaginatively reconstructed in a plausible and interesting manner. The players are pictured as selling plays when it was to their advantage; as being occasionally attacked by pirates; as taking measures to protect their plays against piracy, and as reprinting pirated plays through authorized publishers. This portrayal is, as it must be, largely theoretical.

Underlying the imaginative superstructure of this chapter is the bibliographer's thorough knowledge of the state of the texts. Roughly grouped, there are four plays commonly recognized as having "bad" texts in the early quartos and "good" texts in the First Folio: *Romeo and Juliet*, *Henry V.*, *The Merry Wives of Windsor*, and *Hamlet*. The bad quarto versions are not the foundations of the good Folio texts. Of the fourteen other plays in question, twelve show the use of early quartos as bases of Folio texts. These twelve were duly and correctly entered on the Stationers' Registers. The two exceptions (late entries) Mr. Pollard tries to account for. As none of the five bad quartos was rightly entered and all the twelve good ones were, the entry may be taken as *prima facie* evidence of authorized publication. Mr. Pollard concludes that the players probably handed to the printers the texts of fourteen plays for publication in quartos, three being better texts to set right plays previously pirated. The reader will find it worth while to relate with the brief comments on individual texts in this chapter the more elaborate discussions in Mr. Pollard's *Shakespeare Folios and Quartos*.

Chapter III, "The Manuscripts of Shakespeare's Plays," reconstructs the normal, or usual, history of a play manuscript in Shakespeare's day, thus furnishing a point of departure for students of special text problems. Elizabethan authors are shown to have furnished, at times, rough drafts in autograph as copies for licensing and also as prompt copies for use in theatres. A few tests (simple in theory if not in application) are here supplied for judging autograph copies. Evidence is then given to show that prompt copies were used as sources of texts of some of the "good" (unpirated) plays. Mr. Pollard concludes with the proposition (p. 83):

"It is bibliographically probable that some of the First Quarto editions of Shakespeare's plays were printed from the author's own autograph manuscript, which had previously been used as a prompt-copy; that the actors replaced their manuscript prompt-copy by a copy of the printed Quarto, which in its turn received additional stage-directions and also readings representing some of the variants which were adopted by individual actors; that in 1622 a copy of the last Quarto on the market was sent to the playhouse to be roughly collated with the printed prompt-copy; and that the copy so corrected was the source of the Folio text of a normal play originally printed in a duly registered Quarto."

After considering the possible changes in the text, for better or worse, by prompter, actor, compositor, printer, Mr. Pollard assures us that there are very few plays first printed in quarto for which we need to assume any new manuscript authority to account for the Folio text. Here, as elsewhere, Mr. Pollard does a great service to the student of texts by his emphasis upon the principle of economy in the assumption of intermediate manuscript sources to account for such progressive changes in texts as can be rationally accounted for in other ways by one familiar with contemporary printing and publishing conditions and with theatrical customs.

The fourth chapter, "The Improvers of Shakespeare," draws three important deductions:

1. That no edition subsequent to the first duly registered Quarto can have any authority as a text unless it can be shown to be probable that a new manuscript or its equivalent was used as a source; and in constructing such a theory, the variants in the text must be considered *as a whole* (pp. 84-7).

2. That the first authorized edition of any play may safely be assumed to be nearer than any other to what the author wrote, in matters such as spelling, punctuation, emphasis, capitals, etc.

3. That the First Folio must be regarded as an *edited* text, the actors having tolerated small changes to bring their texts into accordance with the best versions of their day.

After a sad survey of the aims and methods of various editors of Shakespeare, who in one way and another have "improved" Shakespeare's work, Mr. Pollard summarizes the real advances made in the study of the texts since the time of Malone. He then restates the aim of his book as being, to show "that the Quartos regularly entered in the Registers of the Stationers' Company were neither stolen nor surreptitious," and "that some at least of these

editions may have been set up from Shakespeare's autograph manuscript."

On a few minor points in Chapter I, on the book trade, I am inclined to disagree with Mr. Pollard. I do not see that his correction of the wording, *obtained a ch(art)re*, instead of *procured a charter*, in Christopher Barker's letter on the incorporation of the Stationers' Company, invalidates an argument that the Stationers on their own initiative sought a royal charter. Historical usage certainly permits *obtained* in the same sense as *procured*; and the context of Barker's letter just as certainly shows that Barker believed that the Stationers acted on their own initiative in the matter. Nor does Mr. Pollard's ingenious interpretation of the significance of the royal privilege *ad imprimendum solum* (pp. 6-7) convince me—for reasons which I cannot set forth fully in a book-review. Several of the conclusions in this chapter seem to me too general: that the grants of privilege argued a lack of any legal recognition of literary rights (p. 3, p. 24), and that they carried an implication that unprivileged books might be pirated with impunity (p. 4); and that the protection against piracy had no legal force but rested solely on the private ordinances of the Stationers' Company. In his use of the term *legal* throughout the chapter, Mr. Pollard seems to me to mean *statutory*; and it is my conviction that the terms should not be used synonymously in the discussion of Elizabethan copyright. But, as I have discussed all these points at some length in a dissertation written in 1914 (still unpublished), I will refrain from further comment here, and pass to what I consider the really vital aspect of Mr. Pollard's book, his reconstruction of the normal, the regular, the probable history of Shakespeare texts.

If Mr. Pollard's book should do no more than dissuade the prospective editor of Elizabethan texts from the random selection of single variants which please the taste of a modern man of letters or seem imaginatively more "likely" readings (regardless of insuperable obstacles, of a bibliographical nature, in the way of their ever having occurred together in any one presumably authentic version), it will have fulfilled a most important mission. If the reader hesitates to accept Mr. Pollard's position in its entirety (as for instance in the matter of the autograph manuscripts—on which, by the way, Mr. Pollard does not claim completed proof), he should at least remind himself of the much more shaky ground on which

stand that body of "imaginative pessimists" who justify all sorts of liberties with texts by assuming that they have come down to us corrupted by "multiplication by transcript after transcript" and by piracy after piracy, unresented and unatoned. It is refreshing to find, for once, opposed to this very popular black view of Elizabethan publishing conditions, an experienced bibliographer's theory of "imaginative optimism," based on a sound knowledge of the printing customs, and of the texts in question, as well as on an understanding of human nature and sound common-sense.

EVELYN MAY ALBRIGHT.

University of Chicago.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE SUMERIAN ORIGIN OF 'TUN' AND 'BARREL'

The origin of *tun*, from which the terms *tunnel* and *tonneau* are derived, is unknown. The derivation from the Celtic *tonn*, 'skin,' 'surface,' is unsatisfactory, although in the southern parts of Europe and throughout Western Asia skin-bottles are still used for the conveyance and storage of wine, water, etc.¹ Chaucer uses *tun* for *jar*, but, as a rule, it denotes a large *cask* for wine, beer, and other liquids. As a measure of capacity it was equal to about 250 wine-gallons. *Ton* is merely a more archaic spelling of *tun*.

Casks or barrels made of wooden staves bound together with hoops are said to have been invented by the Gauls. Pliny (14, 132) says: *circa Alpes vinum ligneis vasis condunt tectis circulisque cingunt*. For the storage of wine or oil, honey, grain, etc., the Greeks and Romans as well as the Orientals used large jars made of hard-baked clay, which had a pointed base, so that they could be inserted into the ground or into a stand; see Benzinger, *Hebr. Arch.* (1907), pp. 70, 223; Koldewey, *Babylon* (1913), p. 245. The Latin name of these vessels, *amphora* (Greek ἀμφορέως = ἀμφιφρεῖς, 'two-handled') appears in English as *amber*. The corresponding German word *Eimer* is supposed to denote a *one-handled bucket* or pail, while *Zuber*, our *tub*, is said to be a *two-handled tub*; but OHG *einbar* and *zwibar* represent merely popular etymologies. An *Eimer* generally has a hooped handle or bail. *Eimer* = *amber* is *amphora*, and *Zuber* = *tub* must be connected with *tube*. Similarly a half-tun (or butt) was called a *pipe*. In the eighteenth century *tub* denoted also a *small cask* for holding liquor. *Tub* is also a contemptuous term for a *slow boat*. A watertight lining for a shaft in very watery ground is called *tubbing*. In England *tube* is used for a subway in the form of a tunnel.

¹ Cf. O. Schrader, *Sprachvergleichung und Urgeschichte* (1890), p. 378 n.